

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 CHANH VAN NGUYEN,)
12 Plaintiff,) No. C 09-00718 JW (PR)
13 vs.) ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH
14 D. K. SISTO, et al.,) LEAVE TO AMEND
15 Defendants.)
16 _____)
17)

18 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights action pursuant
19 to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on February 18, 2009. Then on April 27, 2009, plaintiff filed a
20 petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, challenging his state
21 conviction. (See Docket No. 6.)

22
23 **DISCUSSION**

24 A. Standard of Review

25 Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which
26 prisoners seek redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a
27 governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The court must identify cognizable
28 claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint “is

1 frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted,” or
2 “seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.” Id. §
3 1915A(b). Pro se pleadings must be liberally construed, however. Balistreri v.
4 Pacifica Police Dep’t, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).

5 To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two
6 elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States
7 was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting
8 under the color of state law. West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

9 **B. Legal Claims**

10 Plaintiff’s “statement of claim,” (Compl. 3), is unclear and fails to meet the
11 minimum standards for stating a cognizable claim under § 1983. Plaintiff has failed
12 to identify what constitutional rights were violated and which defendant committed
13 the alleged violation. See West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. at 48. Plaintiff must set forth
14 specific facts as to each defendant’s conduct that proximately caused a violation of
15 his federally protected rights. See Leer v. Murphy, 844 F.2d 628, 634 (9th Cir.
16 1988). Accordingly, the complaint is DISMISSED with leave to amend to attempt
17 to allege cognizable claims pursuant to § 1983.

18 The Court notes that plaintiff also filed a § 2254 petition. If plaintiff finds
19 that he filed the instant § 1983 complaint in error, he may move for voluntary
20 dismissal of the instant action.

21 **C. Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus**

22 On April 27, 2009, plaintiff filed in the instant action a copy of a petition for
23 a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. (Docket No. 6.) If it is plaintiff’s
24 intent to seek a federal habeas relief from his state conviction by way of a § 2254
25 petition, he must file the petition as a separate action and pay the appropriate filing
26 fee or request leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The Court notes that page 2 of the
27 petition is missing necessary information with respect to the challenged state
28 conviction and sentence. Plaintiff is advised, that should he choose to pursue a §

1 2254 action, he must include all the information requested on the form petition.
2

3 **CONCLUSION**

4 For the foregoing reasons, the Court orders as follows:

5 1. The complaint is DISMISSED with leave to amend, as indicated above.

6 Within **thirty (30) days** of the date this order is filed, plaintiff shall file an amended
7 complaint. The amended complaint must include the caption and civil case number
8 used in this order and the words “AMENDED COMPLAINT” on the first page and
9 write in the case number for this action, Case No. C 09-00718 JW (PR). Because
10 an amended complaint completely replaces the original complaint, plaintiff must
11 include in it all the claims he wishes to present. See Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d
12 1258, 1262 (9th Cir. 1992). Plaintiff may not incorporate material from the original
13 complaint by reference.

14 As discussed above, plaintiff may move for voluntary dismissal of the instant
15 action if he finds he filed the § 1983 action in error.

16 2. It is plaintiff’s responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep
17 the Court informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper with the clerk
18 headed “Notice of Change of Address.” He must comply with the Court’s orders in
19 a timely fashion or ask for an extension of time to do so. Failure to comply may
20 result in the dismissal of this action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
21 41(b).

22 The Clerk shall enclose two copies of the court’s form complaint and two
23 copies of the court form petition with a copy of this order to plaintiff.

24 DATED: _____
25 June 30, 2009
26

27
28 
JAMES WARE
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHANH NGUYEN,

Case Number: CV09-00718 JW

Plaintiff,

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

v.

D.K. SISTO, et al.,

Defendants.

/

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on 7/13/2009, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Chanh Van Nguyen V-07324
CSP Solano State Prison
P. O. Box 4000
Vacaville, Ca 95696-4000

Dated: 7/13/2009

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
/s/ By: Elizabeth Garcia, Deputy Clerk